

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the official action of May 13, 2005. Claims 1-4 presently appear in this case. All of the claims have been subject to a requirement for election of species. Prompt consideration on the merits of all of the claims now present in the case is hereby respectfully urged.

The examiner states that the present application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Group I: Figures 1-4 and Group II: Figure 5. The examiner has required applicant to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The examiner states that claim 1 is generic. It is noted that the examiner has indicated that, upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim.

Applicant hereby elects the species of Group I, Figure 1-4. It is believed that claims 1-2 read on the elected species.

Applicant has not attempted to gather evidence showing the species to be obvious variants. It is noted for

Appln. No. 10/757,571
Amdt. dated June 13, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 13, 2005

the record, however, that this election of species requirement represents an admission on the record on the part of the examiner that each of the species is patentably distinct and, if the examiner finds a references showing only one of the species, then he cannot reject any of the other species over that same reference. If the examiner learns of any evidence which causes him to change his mind as to the patentable distinctness of any of the species, then it is respectfully requested that this be reflected on the record.

With regard to the examiner's comments regarding the "Brief Description of the Drawings," Applicant has amended the specification to include the correct description of Fig. 4 and indicate that the original description of Fig. 4 should have been that for Fig. 5. Applicant submits that the above amendments correct the problem identified by the examiner.

Appln. No. 10/757,571
Amdt. dated June 13, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 13, 2005

Prompt consideration of all the claims reading on
the elected species is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:edg
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\D\dire\CHUANG15\PTO\Amd.doc